REMARKS

Claims 1-9 and 11-20 are pending and under consideration. Claims 1, 11, and 17 are amended herein. Support for the amendments may be found in the claims is filed originally, in Fig. 10, and at page 14, lines 10 and 11 and page 15, lines 8-15 of the specification. Since the amendments to the claims are being made at the behest of the Examiner, this amendment is believed to place the application in condition for allowance, and entry therefore is respectfully requested. In the alternative, entry of this amendment is requested as placing the application in better condition for appeal by, at least, reducing the number of issues outstanding. Further reconsideration is requested based on the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

Response to Arguments:

The Applicants appreciate the consideration given to their arguments. The Applicants, however, are disappointed that their arguments were not found to be persuasive. The final Office Action asserts in section 6, at page 13, lines 4-9 that:

> However, Applicant used the alternative language of "or" which allows for both the prior interpretation and the new interpretations. For instance, regarding the language of storing return addresses to a first and second processing task in a register, there is no limitation detailing how this information is stored. It could very much be stored in the same manner that Fleck does by chaining the contexts.

This is submitted to be incorrect. Fleck has no "task switching function selecting the second return address or the third return address from the register," as recited formerly in, for example, claim 1, regardless of how the second return address and the third return address were stored. Even if they were stored by chaining the contexts together, that would not amount to *selecting* "the second return address or the third return address from the register," since Fleck would have to revert to the return addresses stored in a chain in the *order* of the chain.

The final Office Action goes on to assert in section 6, at page 13, lines 9-14 that:

> The language detailing the task switching function selecting the second or third return address and executing a return operation to that selected address reads upon the same teachings of Fleck that the last tasks pointer context is selected during a return operation and loaded such that that tasks information is restored.

This is also submitted to be incorrect. Fleck has no "task switching function selecting the second return address or the third return address from the register," as recited formerly in, for example, claim 1. Fleck, rather, always returns to the context saved previously, rather than

"selecting the second return address or the third return address from the register," as recited formerly in, for example, claim 1, since return addresses stored in a chain would have to be reselected in the order of the chain.

Nevertheless, in the interest of compact prosecution only, and not for any reason of patentability, the Applicants have amended the claims insubstantial accord with the Examiner suggestion at pages 14, 15, and 16 of the final Office Action. The Applicants appreciate the Examiner's suggestion. Claims 1-9 and 11-20 are thus believed to be allowable, for at least those reasons noted by the Examiner. Further reconsideration is thus requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102:

Claims 1-8, 11-17, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Fleck et al., US 6,128,641 (hereinafter "Fleck"). The rejection is traversed to the extent it might apply to the claims as amended. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The eighth clause of claim 1 recites:

Selecting a return address from the register based on the return call with the task switching function while maintaining the storage of the second return address.

Fleck neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests "selecting a return address from the register based on the return call with the task switching function while maintaining the storage of the second return address," as acknowledged graciously in the final Office Action. Claim 1 is thus submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 2-8 depend from claim 1 and add further distinguishing elements. Claims 2-8 are thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-8 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 11-16:

The fourth clause of claim 11 recites:

A memory management apparatus coupled to said input and said memory, and responsive to said instruction information indicating a return instruction for moving said return address from said second storage location to a register of the data processor while maintaining the first storage location in memory.

Fleck neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests "a memory management apparatus coupled to said input and said memory, and responsive to said instruction information indicating a return

instruction for moving said return address from said second storage location to a register of the data processor while maintaining the first storage location in memory," as acknowledged graciously in the final Office Action. Claim 11 is thus submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 11 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 12-16 depend from claim 11 and add further distinguishing elements. Claims 12-16 are thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 12-16 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 17:

The fourth clause of claim 17 recites:

A memory management apparatus coupled to said input and said memory, and responsive to said instruction information indicating a return instruction for moving said return address from said second storage location to a register of the data processing apparatus while maintaining the first storage location in memory.

Fleck neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests "a memory management apparatus coupled to said input and said memory, and responsive to said instruction information indicating a return instruction for moving said return address from said second storage location to a register of the data processing apparatus while maintaining the first storage location in memory," as acknowledged graciously in the final Office Action. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 17 is earnestly solicited.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103:

Claims 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Fleck. Claim 18 depends from claim 17 and adds further distinguishing elements. Fleck neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests "a memory management apparatus coupled to said input and said memory, and responsive to said instruction information indicating a return instruction for moving said return address from said second storage location to a register of the data processing apparatus while maintaining the first storage location in memory," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 17. Claim 18 is thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 18 is earnestly solicited.

<u>Claims 9 and 20</u>:

Claims 9 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Fleck in view of "Applicant's Admitted Prior Art." Claim 9 depends from claim 1 and adds further distinguishing elements. Fleck neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests "selecting the third return address from the register based on the return call with the task switching function while maintaining the storage of the second return address," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. The parts of the Application labeled "Prior Art" do not either, and thus cannot make up for the deficiencies of Fleck with respect to claim 9.

Claim 20 depends from claim 17 and adds further distinguishing elements. Fleck neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests "a memory management apparatus coupled to said input and said memory, and responsive to said instruction information indicating a return instruction for moving said return address from said second storage location to a register of the data processing apparatus while maintaining the first storage location in memory," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 17. The parts of the Application labeled "Prior Art" do not either, and thus cannot make up for the deficiencies of Fleck with respect to claims 9 and 20. Claims 9 and 20 are thus submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9 and 20 is earnestly solicited.

Conclusion:

Claims 1-9, and 11-20 are submitted to be allowable over the cited references. There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Application Serial No. 10/028,899
Amendment filed April 11, 2008
Reply to final Office Action mailed January 11, 2008

      If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

<div align="center">
Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
</div>

Date: April 11, 2008   By: /Thomas E. McKiernan/
                                                            Thomas E. McKiernan
                                                            Registration No. 37,899

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501